UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/573,323	09/28/2006	Katrin Counradi	P29298	4896

7055 7590 12/09/2008

GREENBLUM & BERNSTEIN, P.L.C.
1950 ROLAND CLARKE PLACE
RESTON, VA 20191

EXAMINER	
MKUK, BRIAN P	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1796	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
12/09/2008	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

gbpatent@gbpatent.com
pto@gbpatent.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/573,323	COUNRADI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Brian P. Mruk	1796	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *09 January 2007*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *10-40* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *10-40* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☒ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *1/9/07*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. The examiner construes the phrase "substantially free of cationic polymers" recited in instant claims 30 and 40 to mean "less than 0.5% by weight of a cationic polymer" as defined by applicant on page 13, lines 1-2 of the instant specification.

Priority

2. Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

Claim Objections

3. Claim 30 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form. Specifically, since the examiner construes the phrase "substantially free of cationic polymers" recited in instant claim 30 to mean "less than 0.5% by weight of a cationic polymer" as defined by applicant on page 13, lines 1-2 of the instant specification, the examiner asserts that instant claim 30 fails to further limit claim 29. Appropriate correction and/or clarification is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.
>
> (e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 10-40 are anticipated rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Sonneville-Aubrun et al, US 2003/0206955.

Sonneville-Aubrun et al, US 2003/0206955, discloses a cosmetic composition comprising oil globules, an anionic polymer that is a crosslinked acrylate polymer (see abstract and paragraph 54), and adjunct ingredients, such as surfactants. Specifically, note Examples 1-2, which contain disodium acyl glutamate, an acrylate copolymer, water, and adjunct ingredients, per the requirements of the instant invention. Therefore, instant claims 10-40 are anticipated by Sonneville-Aubrun et al, US 2003/0206955.

In the alternative that the above disclosure is insufficient to anticipate the above listed claims, it would have nonetheless been obvious to the skilled artisan to produce the claimed composition, as the reference teaches each of the claimed ingredients within the claimed proportions for the same utility.

7. Claims 10, 11, 14 and 17-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Muller et al, US 2004/0234482.

Muller et al, US 2004/0234482, discloses a cosmetic composition comprising at least one crosslinked copolymer of methacrylic acid and at least one alkyl acrylate, and a surfactant (see abstract). It is further taught by Muller et al that suitable crosslinked copolymers include AQUA SF-1 in an amount of 0.01-10% by weight (see paragraphs

26-35), that the composition contains 0.2-40% by weight of an anionic surfactant (see paragraphs 41-47), and that the composition is in the form of a gel (see paragraphs 205 and 210), per the requirements of the instant invention. Specifically, note Examples 1-5. Therefore, instant claims 10, 11, 14 and 17-30 are anticipated by Muller et al, US 2004/0234482.

In the alternative that the above disclosure is insufficient to anticipate the above listed claims, it would have nonetheless been obvious to the skilled artisan to produce the claimed composition, as the reference teaches each of the claimed ingredients within the claimed proportions for the same utility.

8. Claims 10, 11, 14, 17-26, 29 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Patel, US 2004/0023820.

Patel, US 2004/0023820, discloses a liquid soap comprising vitamin-containing microcapsules (see abstract and paragraph 12), 20-40% by weight of water (see paragraph 13), 1-40% by weight of an anionic surfactant (see paragraph 13), 5.75-7% by weight of a crosslinked acrylic polymer, such as AQUA SF-1 (see paragraph 19), and adjunct ingredients (see paragraph 22), per the requirements of the instant invention. Specifically, note Examples 1-4. Therefore, instant claims 10, 11, 14, 17-26, 29 and 30 are anticipated by Patel, US 2004/0023820.

In the alternative that the above disclosure is insufficient to anticipate the above listed claims, it would have nonetheless been obvious to the skilled artisan to produce

the claimed composition, as the reference teaches each of the claimed ingredients within the claimed proportions for the same utility.

9. Claims 10-26 and 29-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Strabner et al, DE 10147049.

Strabner et al, DE 10147049, discloses a detergent composition comprising 1.0% by weight of sodium cocoyl glutamate, 1.3% by weight of an acrylate crosspolymer, water, and adjunct ingredients (see page 6, Examples 405), per the requirements of the instant invention. Therefore, instant claims 10-26 and 29-37 are anticipated by Strabner et al, DE 10147049.

In the alternative that the above disclosure is insufficient to anticipate the above listed claims, it would have nonetheless been obvious to the skilled artisan to produce the claimed composition, as the reference teaches each of the claimed ingredients within the claimed proportions for the same utility.

Double Patenting

10. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir.

1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

11. Claims 10, 11, 14 and 17-30 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 31-60 of copending Application No. 11/179,491. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because copending Application No. 11/179,491 claims a similar cosmetic gel composition comprising an anionic surfactant, a crosslinked acrylate copolymer, water, and adjunct ingredients (see claims 31-60 of copending Application No. 11/179,491), per the requirements of the instant invention. Therefore, instant claims 10, 11, 14 and 17-30 are an obvious formulation in view of claims 31-60 of copending Application No. 11/179,491.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

12. Claims 10, 11, 14 and 17-30 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-37 and 40-48 of copending Application No. 10/830,001. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because copending

Application No. 10/830,001 claims a similar cosmetic gel composition comprising an anionic surfactant, an acrylate copolymer, water, and adjunct ingredients (see claims 1-37 and 40-48 of copending Application No. 10/830,001), per the requirements of the instant invention. Therefore, instant claims 10, 11, 14 and 17-30 are an obvious formulation in view of claims 1-37 and 40-48 of copending Application No. 10/830,001.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

13. Claims 10, 11, 14 and 17-30 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 15-49 of copending Application No. 11/573,329. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because copending Application No. 11/573,329 claims a similar cosmetic gel composition comprising an anionic surfactant, a crosslinked acrylate copolymer, water, and adjunct ingredients (see claims 15-49 of copending Application No. 11/573,329), per the requirements of the instant invention. Therefore, instant claims 10, 11, 14 and 17-30 are an obvious formulation in view of claims 15-49 of copending Application No. 11/573,329.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

14. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brian P. Mruk whose telephone number is (571) 272-1321. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thurs (7:00 AM-5:30 PM).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Harold Pyon can be reached on (571) 272-1498. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Brian P Mruk/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1796

Brian P Mruk
December 4, 2008

Brian P Mruk
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1796